

STATE OF MAINE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Docket No. 2002-271

June 12, 2002

VERIZON NEW ENGLAND INC.
D/B/A VERIZON MAINE
Request for Approval of Amendments
to Interconnection Agreement with
Lightship Telecom, LLC

ORDER APPROVING
AMENDMENTS NO. 2 AND 3
TO INTERCONNECTION
AGREEMENT WITH
LIGHTSHIP TELECOM, LLC

WELCH, Chairman; NUGENT and DIAMOND, Commissioners

In this Order, we approve two amendments to an Interconnection Agreement between Verizon New England Inc., d/b/a Verizon Maine (Verizon Maine) and Lightship Telecom, LLC (Lightship), pursuant to section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

On April 26, 2002, in Docket No. 2002-177, the Commission approved an interconnection agreement between Verizon Maine and Lightship. That agreement incorporated terms and conditions of a separate agreement between Verizon New York and Level 3 Communications, LLC, approved by the New York Public Service Commission on April 27, 2001 in Docket No. 01-C-0148. As part of its April 26, 2002 Order, the Commission approved Amendment No. 1 to the agreement between Verizon Maine and Lightship.

On May 21, 2002, Verizon Maine filed Amendments 2 and 3 to its agreement with Lightship pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252, enacted by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Interconnection agreements provide for interconnection between an incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) and another telecommunications carrier, including a competitive local exchange carrier (CLEC). An interconnection agreement may allow a telecommunications carrier to purchase unbundled network elements or local services at a discounted wholesale rate (the discount reflecting avoided cost), or both, from an ILEC (or CLEC). Amendment No. 2 incorporates a UNE Remand Attachment with a Pricing Appendix into the agreement. Amendment No. 3 provides for one-way and two-way interconnection trunks.

Section 252(e)(2) states that a state commission may reject a negotiated agreement only if it finds that "the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement" or if "the implementation of such agreement or portion is not consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity." We received no comments by the comment deadline set in a May 24, 2002 Notice of Opportunity to Comment Agreement. We do not make either of the findings set for in section 252(e)(2) for rejection, and we therefore approve the agreement amendments.

We qualify our approval in two respects, however, and reserve findings on future potential issues. First, we reserve judgment on whether the rates contained in the amended agreement are reasonable from the perspective of Verizon Maine's retail ratepayers. Verizon Maine is presently under an alternative form of regulation (AFOR) ordered by the Commission in Docket No. 94-123. The AFOR began in December, 1995. Under the AFOR, Verizon Maine bears the risk of lost revenues resulting from rates that are too low. In Docket No. 99-851, we have continued the AFOR until May 31, 2006. We do not resolve whether Verizon Maine is receiving reasonable compensation from any CLECs that may avail themselves of the rates provided to Lightship pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252(i).

Second, section 271(c) of the Act, 47 U.S.C. § 271(c), requires that the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs) meet certain requirements before they are allowed to provide interLATA service (the so-called "competitive checklist"). Under section 271(d)(3), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) must determine whether the BOC has met the competitive checklist before granting the BOC authority to provide interLATA service within its region. Prior to making that determination, the FCC must consult with state commissions to verify the compliance of the BOC with the checklist. Our approval of these agreement amendments should not be construed as a finding that Verizon Maine has met those requirements.

The agreement amendments filed by Verizon Maine provide for interconnection between Lightship and Verizon Maine's network in Maine. If Lightship seeks to interconnect with networks maintained by other incumbent local exchange carriers in Maine, it must seek a termination, suspension, or modification of the exemption contained in 47 U.S.C. 251(f)(1)(A).

ORDERING PARAGRAPHS

Accordingly, we

1. Approve Amendment Nos. 2 and 3 to the Interconnection Agreement between Verizon New England Inc., d/b/a Verizon Maine and Lightship Telecom, LLC attached hereto, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252(e); and
2. Order that the Administrative Director shall make a copy of the attached Amendments available for public inspection and copying pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 252(h) within 10 days of the date of this Order.

Dated at Augusta, Maine, this 12th day of June, 2002.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

Dennis L. Keschl
Administrative Director

COMMISSIONERS VOTING FOR: Welch

Nugent
Diamond

NOTICE OF RIGHTS TO REVIEW OR APPEAL

5 M.R.S.A. § 9061 requires the Public Utilities Commission to give each party to an adjudicatory proceeding written notice of the party's rights to review or appeal of its decision made at the conclusion of the adjudicatory proceeding. The methods of review or appeal of PUC decisions at the conclusion of an adjudicatory proceeding are as follows:

1. Reconsideration of the Commission's Order may be requested under Section 1004 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (65-407 C.M.R.110) within 20 days of the date of the Order by filing a petition with the Commission stating the grounds upon which reconsideration is sought.
2. Appeal of a final decision of the Commission may be taken to the Law Court by filing, within **21 days** of the date of the Order, a Notice of Appeal with the Administrative Director of the Commission, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(1)-(4) and the Maine Rules of Appellate Procedure.
3. Additional court review of constitutional issues or issues involving the justness or reasonableness of rates may be had by the filing of an appeal with the Law Court, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(5).

Note: The attachment of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the particular document may be subject to review or appeal. Similarly, the failure of the Commission to attach a copy of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the document is not subject to review or appeal.